REMARKS

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claim rejections set forth in the Office Action dated April 19, 2006.

Summary

Claims 1 – 10 are currently pending in the application.

Claims 1, 4 and 8 were amended. No new matter was added as a result of these amendments.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1 – 10 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerpheide et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,680,731; "Gerpheide") in view of Taylor et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0025679; "Taylor"). Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, the electrodes are bonded to a rear surface of an insulating support plate that supports the input sensor.

Gerpheide fails to disclose the electrodes are bonded to a rear surface of an insulating support plate that supports the input sensor. Gerpheide teaches a contrary arrangement. Gerpheide only teaches that the "plastic sheets 84" are "aligned so as to be disposed underneath the plastic sheets 80 of the touch-sensitive surface." (Column 7, Lines 28 – 30). Gerpheide only teaches that the plastic sheets 84 are disposed underneath the touch-sensitive surface and not that the plastic sheets 84 are bonded to the surface. More specifically, Gerpheide fails to disclose whether the plastic sheets 84 are in intimate contact with the touch-sensitive surface. In fact, Gerpheide suggests an arrangment where the plastic sheets 80 are only "relatively close" to the surface. (Column 7, Lines 38 - 40). Accordingly, Gerpheide fails to disclose the electrodes are bonded to a rear surface of an insulating support plate. Therefore, Claim 1 is allowable over Gerpheide.

Taylor also fails to disclose the electrodes are bonded to a rear surface of an insulating support plate that supports the input sensor. In addition to Taylor failing to disclose an arrangement where the touchpad 26 is bonded to a insulating support plate, Taylor suggests that the touchpad 26 does not contact the keymat 22. As described in

Taylor, "the touchpad 26 must be located as close to the keymat 22 and key 20 as possible." (Paragraph 46). This arrangement suggests that the touchpad 26 must be located as close to the keymat 22 as possible without touching it. Taylor fails to suggest the electrodes are bonded to a rear surface of an insulating support plate that supports the input sensor. Accordingly, Claim 1 is allowable over Taylor.

Dependent Claims 2-3 depend from an allowable base claim and are allowable for at least this reason.

Independent Claim 4 recites, *inter alia*, the input sensor is bonded on the reverse side of the upper surface. This feature is similar to the distinguishable feature recited in amended Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 4 is allowable for at least the same reasons as stated above. Therefore, Claim 4 is allowable over the cited prior art.

Dependent Claims 5-7 depend from an allowable base claim and are allowable for at least this reason.

Independent Claim 8 recites, *inter alia*, the input sensor is bonded around a support plate of a curved surface, and the circuit substrate is bonded to a support plate of a planar surface. This feature is similar to the distinguishable feature recited in amended Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 4 is allowable for at least the same reasons as stated above. Therefore, Claim 4 is allowable over the cited prior art.

Dependent Claims 9 – 10 depend from an allowable base claim and are allowable for at least this reason.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons presented above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned in the event that a telephone interview would expedite consideration of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Gustavo Siller, Jr.

Registration No. 32,305

Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE P.O. BOX 10395 CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610 (312) 321-4200